IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,))
Plaintiff,) 8:12CR82)
vs.) ORDER
RUTH TAYLOR,) }
Defendant.)

This matter is before the court on the motion to continue by defendant Ruth Taylor (Taylor) (Filing No. 15). Taylor seeks a continuance of the trial of this matter which is scheduled for July 2, 2012.

However, the motion does not comply with Paragraph 9 of the Progression Order and NECrimR 12.1 (a), which provides, in part:

Unless excused by the court in individual cases, a motion to continue the trial setting of a criminal case must state facts demonstrating that the ends of justice served by a continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial, (see 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(A)), or that for some other reason, the continuance will not violate the Speedy Trial Act. Unless excused by the court in individual cases, if the defendant is a moving party the motion shall be accompanied by the defendant's affidavit or declaration (see 28 U.S.C. § 1746) stating that defendant:

- (1) Was advised by the defense attorney of the reasons for seeking a continuance;
- (2) Understands that the time sought by the extension may be excluded from any calculation of time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161-3174; and
- (3) With this understanding and knowledge, agrees to the filing of the motion.

The motion is not accompanied by the defendant's affidavit or declaration stating the requirements of (1) $_{\checkmark}$, (2) $_{\checkmark}$, or (3) $_{\checkmark}$ above.

Accordingly, the motion (Filing No. 15) is held in abeyance **until June 27, 2012**, and if the deficiency noted above is not corrected, the motion will be denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 20th day of June, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Thomas D. Thalken United States Magistrate Judge